

This is a no-brainer, and it would be a tremendous asset in the midst of the economic and geopolitical challenges we face today. The pandemic and supply chain turmoil have proven that friends are invaluable in a pinch. While many global relationships have been unsteady and many governments don't know what their future trading relationships will look like, the United Kingdom has been a stalwart and secure partner with the United States.

Furthermore, it could not be a better move in the age of great power competition with China. We will not beat China by trying to be like China in imposing centralized command-and-control grips on the economy that will strangle trade and trample free enterprise. Instead, we should do what we have always done best: prioritize free, open, and fair commerce with friendly nations, as the G7 this past weekend confirmed.

At the conclusion of the summit, the group, as a whole, agreed to "secure our future prosperity by championing freer, fairer trade within a reformed trading system." And the United States and the United Kingdom signed a New Atlantic Charter in which both countries committed to take actions "enabling open and fair trade between nations."

Securing a mutually beneficial trade agreement with one of our oldest and closest allies would be in the best interest of us all. As President Biden himself recently said: "America's alliances are our greatest asset, and leading with diplomacy means standing shoulder-to-shoulder with our allies and key partners once again."

On this point, I could not agree with President Biden more. Congress can seize this opportunity by supporting the resolution before us today. It is a simple, straightforward resolution declaring the sense of the Senate that the United States has and should have a close and mutually beneficial trade relationship with the United Kingdom without interruption and that the President, with the support of Congress, should lay the groundwork for a future trade agreement between the United States and the United Kingdom.

Borrowing a phrase from Prime Minister Boris Johnson, after his first face-to-face meeting with President Biden at the summit this past weekend, the United States-United Kingdom relationship is "indestructible." No two nations have worked more closely together. No two peoples have done more to expand and defend liberty or to achieve peace and prosperity.

Throughout history, this partnership has steadied the world through some of its greatest perils. It can continue to do so today if only we let it. The American and British peoples have the opportunity to once again join forces and emerge from the challenges we face stronger than ever for the benefit of our countries and nations across the globe. To that end, I urge each of my colleagues to support this resolution.

And I ask unanimous consent that the Finance Committee be discharged from further consideration, and the Senate now proceed to S. Res. 134. I further ask that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, first, this resolution—and I am just going to make a few key points here—is on the trade agreement with the UK, and it is a question of international trade, which falls under the jurisdiction of the Finance Committee.

The committee has not been consulted on the resolution so Senators have not had adequate time to consider it. Needless to say, the prospect of reshaping the American economy with sweeping trade deals is not something that should just rocket past the committee of jurisdiction.

Second, I have serious concerns about blessing a potential trade agreement with the United Kingdom when the contents of such an agreement are still unknown. I stated a number of times that there are serious issues that need consideration with respect to our economic relationship with the United Kingdom. That cannot happen if the debates play out in a slapdash process on the floor of the Senate.

For example, the United Kingdom has not only proposed but implemented a discriminatory digital service tax since entering negotiations with the United States. What they are doing is opportunistically looting American technology companies before these measures are shut down by an FTA or another agreement. The UK is also considering other discriminatory policies.

The UK must commit to abandoning these unfair policies, which are serious barriers to trade, a detriment to the special relationship, harmful to American workers, as a precondition of honest and worthwhile negotiations.

Otherwise, if Senators are going to rush to hand out big promises on trade talks, they risk surrendering America's negotiating position on these key issues without getting anything in return.

So I don't see the wisdom in undermining good-paying American jobs and American businesses with a trading partner that has thus far seen no reason to back away from discriminatory measures. For those reasons, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I appreciate the comments and the insight provided by my friend and colleague, the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

As to the point regarding our relative negotiating power and the wisdom of approaching this task right now, it is important to remember this resolution doesn't purport to offer the details of

any such deal. It calls for a free-trade agreement. There is nothing surrendered by that. There is, however, a lot to be gained by that in signaling that we want to continue to have an open, free, and fair relationship with the United Kingdom.

As to the process concerns articulated by my friend and colleague, while he has expressed some concerns about the process, I must provide some evidence to the contrary.

Over the past year, my staff has communicated with the Senate Finance Committee staff, staff on both sides of the aisle, upward of half a dozen times. They have also pitched changes to assuage concerns about language multiple times but never received any definitive responses.

Furthermore, I have worked with colleagues on the other side of the aisle to craft almost identical draft language on United States-United Kingdom trade that was included in S. Res. 117, on the Good Friday Agreement, which passed before this body without objection. There is no reason why we can't reach a similar compromise on this legislation, and I stand ready and willing to work with my colleague from Oregon to do so.

(At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

VOTE EXPLANATION

• Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, due to a family medical emergency, I was unable to attend today's vote on confirmation of Executive Calendar No. 119, Lina M. Khan, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner. Had I been able to attend, I would have voted yea on confirmation. •

TRIBUTE TO MAJOR GENERAL BRIAN S. EIFLER

Mr. REED. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Mr. INHOFE, as the chair and ranking member of the Senate Armed Services Committee and the co-chairs of the Senate Army Caucus, it is our honor to pay tribute to a great leader and an exceptional officer of the U.S. Army MG Brian S. Eifler, the chief of legislative liaison for the Office of the Secretary of the Army, as he prepares to leave this position for a new post in the Army of even greater importance to our Nation. Major General Eifler provides outstanding leadership, advice, and sound professional judgment on numerous critical issues of enduring importance to the Army, Congress, and this Nation.

Major General Eifler has served our Army and our Nation for more than 30 years. A native of Michigan, Major General Eifler was commissioned in 1990 as an infantry officer from Central Michigan University. He has been a true professional, dedicated soldier, leader, and officer. Throughout his career, he has commanded our great soldiers at many levels and deployed to